

Supersymmetric $SO(10)$ And A Prediction For θ_{13}

Qaisar Shafi^{a1} and Zurab Tavartkiladze^{b2}

^a*Bartol Research Institute, Department of Physics and Astronomy
University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716, USA*

^b*Physics Department, Theory Division, CERN, CH-1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland*

Abstract

We present a predictive scheme for fermion masses and mixings based on supersymmetric $SO(10)$ which provides an understanding of the observed hierarchies in the charged fermion sector including CKM mixings. In the neutrino sector bi-large mixing can be realized, while the third leptonic mixing angle $\theta_{13} \simeq 0.01 - 0.2$.

The $SO(10)$ gauge group has many attractive features for building Grand Unified Theories (GUT) [1]. The standard model (SM) chiral fermions together with the SM singlet right handed neutrinos (RHN) can be unified in the 16 dimensional spinorial representations: $16 \supset (q, u^c, d^c, l, e^c, \nu^c)$. The RHN states help generate non zero neutrino masses which can account for atmospheric [2] and solar [3] neutrino oscillations. The masses of ν^c states arise from the breaking of lepton number and this ingredient proves decisive for generating the observed baryon asymmetry of the Universe through leptogenesis [4]. The supersymmetric (SUSY) version of $SO(10)$ strongly suggests unification of the SM gauge couplings at scale $M_G \simeq 2 \cdot 10^{16}$ GeV.

Many attempts have been made for building phenomenologically realistic models based on $SO(10)$ [5]- [17]. The problems associated with $SO(10)$ model building arise both from the scalar as well as the fermion sector. The scalar sector should be arranged to yield a suitable symmetry breaking pattern with preferably (for MSSM unification) a one step symmetry reduction, $SO(10) \rightarrow SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \equiv G_{321}$. At the same time, it is challenging to have natural doublet-triplet (DT) splitting in order to avoid rapid nucleon decay, and also maintain successful unification of the three SM gauge couplings. For resolving the DT splitting problem the mechanism in [6] (often called the missing VEV mechanism) can be invoked. Although its realization requires a complicated higgs sector supplemented by additional symmetries needed to avoid unwanted operators [8], [12], [15], it is a nice feature of $SO(10)$ that DT splitting can be realized without fine tuning.

¹E-mail address: shafi@bartol.udel.edu

²E-mail address: Zurab.Tavartkiladze@cern.ch

In this paper we do not consider the details of the scalar sector and concentrate mainly on the fermion sector. Therefore, our choice of the $SO(10)$ non-trivial scalar states will be as minimal as possible. For breaking SUSY $SO(10)$ down to G_{321} , it is enough to introduce the scalar superfields $\Sigma(45) + C(16) + \bar{C}(\bar{16})$, where the brackets display the dimensions of the $SO(10)$ representations. The rank reduction from five to four is achieved by the VEVs $\langle C \rangle = \langle \bar{C} \rangle$ in ν^c direction, while $\langle \Sigma \rangle$ can be in a suitable direction preserving G_{321} . To have a renormalizable Yukawa coupling for the top quark, we also introduce $H(10)$ state in which the light $h_u + h_d$ pair of MSSM higgs doublet superfields reside. Note that, in principle, nothing prevents the $C, \bar{C}$ states from also contributing with some weights to the physical doublet states [7]. In fact, as we will see below, this can play an important role for realizing realistic pattern for fermion masses and mixings.

Turning to the fermion sector, let us note that the minimal version of SUSY $SO(10)$ (containing only three matter 16-plets and a single higgs 10-plet) gives the incorrect asymptotic relations $\hat{M}_U \propto \hat{M}_D = \hat{M}_E$, $V_{CKM} = \mathbf{1}$ and is therefore excluded. To build a realistic model some extension is needed and numerous attempts have been considered (for an incomplete list see [5]- [17]). In this paper we wish to build a simple and economical scenario with realistic fermion pattern, and which also accounts for bi-large atmospheric and solar neutrino mixings. The task is not trivial and to achieve our goal we first formulate the principles which serve us as a guide for model building:

- 1) The field content must be as economical as possible in order to keep the model simple and maintain perturbativity up to the cut off scale.
- 2) We wish to have the cut off scale at or near $M_{\text{Pl}} \simeq 2.4 \cdot 10^{18}$ GeV, so there is a large enough gap between M_G and the cut off. Therefore there is a large interval where $SO(10)$ is unbroken, and with a fixed field content one can check perturbativity of the unified gauge coupling $\alpha_{SO(10)}$ up to M_{Pl} , taking into account all relevant threshold corrections.
- 3) All operators allowed by the symmetries must be taken into account, so that the conclusions are robust.
- 4) Last but not least, we would like to make the selection of the states and symmetries in such a way as to limit the allowed couplings and maximize the predictions. The third leptonic mixing angle θ_{13} is a particularly important target in this regard.

In the fermion sector, in addition to the three 16-plets, one can also introduce fermionic 10-plet states. The latter contain vector-like states with the quantum numbers of the left handed doublet and down type quark. Because of this, the 10-plets can play an important role [12], [13], [14], in the generation of charged fermion masses and mixings. In addition, one may need to introduce (scalar or fermionic) singlet superfields. They can play an important role in generating the desirable hierarchies and in explaining neutrino oscillations. In order to protect the hierarchies and create predictive power, we introduce an R -symmetry which will play a central role in our considerations.

The scalar and fermionic states (involved in the charged fermion sector) are given in table 1, which also lists the R -charges of the corresponding state. S and $\bar{S}$ denote scalar superfields which are singlets under $SO(10)$, while 10 and $10'$ are matter supermultiplets. The role of each state and R -charge assignment should become clear shortly. Under R , the superfield ϕ_i and the superpotential respectively transform as $\phi_i \rightarrow e^{i\alpha_i} \phi_i$ and $W \rightarrow e^{i(2\alpha_3 + \alpha_H)} W$. Table 1 lists all non trivial $SO(10)$ representations, so we can immediately check whether perturbativity works or not up to M_{Pl} .

Assuming for simplicity that below M_G we just have the MSSM field content, the additional states enter into play above M_G , so that $\alpha^{-1}(\mu) = \alpha^{-1}(M_G) + \frac{3}{2\pi} \ln \frac{\mu}{M_G}$ (for $\mu > M_G$). Taking $\alpha(M_G) \simeq 1/24.4$ we get $\alpha(M_{\text{Pl}}) \simeq 1/26.7$. Therefore, we remain in perfect perturbative regime

Table 1: R -charges of introduced states.

	$\Sigma(45)$	$C(16)$	$\bar{C}(\bar{16})$	S	$\bar{S}$
R	α_Σ	$\frac{1}{2}\alpha_H - \frac{1}{4}\alpha_S + 2\alpha_\Sigma$	$-\frac{1}{2}\alpha_H - \frac{3}{4}\alpha_S + 2\alpha_\Sigma$	α_S	$\alpha_{\bar{S}}$
	$H(10)$	16_1	$16_2, 16_3$	10	$10'$
R	α_H	$\alpha_3 - 3\alpha_\Sigma + \frac{1}{2}\alpha_S$	$\alpha_3 - \alpha_\Sigma, \alpha_3$	$\alpha_3 + \frac{1}{2}\alpha_H - \frac{3}{4}\alpha_S - \alpha_\Sigma$	$\alpha_3 + \frac{1}{2}\alpha_H + \frac{3}{4}\alpha_S - \alpha_\Sigma$

which ensures that the prediction for gauge coupling unification can be trusted and also all possible GUT threshold corrections are calculable. This allows one to introduce, if needed, additional superheavy vector-like states. For instance, up to 8 pairs of $16 + \bar{16}$ would be allowed. To fix the allowed field content from the requirement of perturbativity up to M_{Pl} , let us point out that it is possible to introduce several 45 and 54 states with masses $\gtrsim M_G$. For example, the allowed numbers which preserve perturbativity are $(n_{45}, n_{54}) = (5, 0), (4, 1), (1, 3)$. Several scalar 45-plets together with 54-plet can play an important role in the solution of DT splitting problem [8], [12], [15]. Larger representations such 126 and 210 (which can play crucial roles in symmetry breaking and fermion mass matrices [17]) are not favored from this viewpoint because the $SO(10)$ gauge coupling blows up not far above the scale M_G , thus not allowing a sufficiently high cut off scale. We will not pursue a detailed study of these issues here but only mention that the selection of a high cut off scale $M^* \approx M_{\text{Pl}}$ is also important for suppressing operators such as $(\frac{\Sigma}{M^*})^n F_{\mu\nu}^2$, which introduce unknown threshold corrections [18]. With $M^* \approx M_{\text{Pl}}$, these corrections can be safely ignored.

The hierarchies between charged fermion Yukawa couplings and the CKM mixing elements can be parameterized by the parameter $\lambda \simeq 0.2$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_t &\sim 1, & \lambda_u : \lambda_c : \lambda_t &\sim \lambda^8 : \lambda^4 : 1. \\
\lambda_b &\sim \lambda_\tau \sim \frac{m_b}{m_t} \tan \beta, & \lambda_d : \lambda_s : \lambda_b &\sim \lambda^4 : \lambda^2 : 1. \\
\lambda_e : \lambda_\mu : \lambda_\tau &\sim \lambda^5 : \lambda^2 : 1. \\
V_{us} &\approx \lambda, & V_{cb} &\approx \lambda^2, & V_{ub} &= \lambda^4 - \lambda^3,
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where the MSSM parameter $\tan \beta = \frac{v_u}{v_d}$. Our aim is to gain a natural understanding of this hierarchical pattern. As expansion parameters, in addition to $\lambda \simeq (0.2)$, we exploit the dimensionless parameter $\frac{M_G}{M_{\text{Pl}}} \sim \lambda^2 \sim 10^{-2}$. Powers of this naturally appear from the Planck scale suppressed non renormalizable operators. Note that we take $\langle C \rangle = \langle \bar{C} \rangle \sim \langle \Sigma \rangle \simeq M_G$. In addition we assume that the scalar components of the superfields $S, \bar{S}$ also develop VEVs close to M_G . Thus,

$$\frac{\langle S \rangle}{M_{\text{Pl}}} \sim \frac{\langle \bar{S} \rangle}{M_{\text{Pl}}} \sim \frac{\langle C \rangle}{M_{\text{Pl}}} = \frac{\langle \bar{C} \rangle}{M_{\text{Pl}}} \sim \frac{\langle \Sigma \rangle}{M_{\text{Pl}}} \equiv \epsilon \sim 10^{-2}. \tag{2}$$

With the R -charge assignments in table 1, the couplings of 16-plets with $H(10)$ are

$$\begin{matrix} 16_1 \\ 16_2 \\ 16_3 \end{matrix} \begin{pmatrix} 16_1 & 16_2 & 16_3 \\ \frac{\Sigma^2 \bar{C} C}{M_{P1}^4} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \left(\frac{\Sigma}{M_{P1}}\right)^2 & \frac{\Sigma}{M_{P1}} \\ 0 & \frac{\Sigma}{M_{P1}} & 1 \end{pmatrix} H , \quad (3)$$

where in each entry a dimensionless couplings of order unity is understood. Due to the appearance of operators of varying dimensions, there will be hierarchical structure between masses and mixings of different generations. The selection given in table 1 reduces the number of parameters and allows one to make several predictions.

From (3) the asymptotic up type quark Yukawas are

$$\lambda_t \sim 1 , \quad \lambda_u : \lambda_c : \lambda_t \sim \epsilon^4 : \epsilon^2 : 1 . \quad (4)$$

Note that the contribution of $SO(10)$ violating VEV $\langle \Sigma \rangle$ is strongly suppressed for the third generation 16_3 -plet, so that at M_G we have

$$\lambda_t = \lambda_b = \lambda_\tau . \quad (5)$$

On the other hand, the effect of $\langle \Sigma \rangle$ in the couplings involving second and first generations is strong. This means that the rotations arising from up and down left handed quark flavors are misaligned. This gives non trivial contribution to the CKM mixing matrix. From (3) we see that $V_{cb} \sim \epsilon$ has the correct magnitude. However, V_{us} and V_{ub} vanish at this stage and the contributions to the first and second generation masses of charged leptons and down quarks are negligible. Thus, additional contributions are necessary. We now come to the important role played by 10, $10'$ -plets and $C, \bar{C}$ states³. The relevant couplings (allowed by $SO(10) \times R$ symmetry) are

$$\frac{\Sigma^2}{M_{P1}} 10 \cdot 10' + \frac{S}{M_{P1}} 10 C 16_2 + \frac{CC}{M_{P1}} 16_1 \cdot 16_2 + \frac{\bar{C}}{M_{P1}} 10' H 16_2 . \quad (6)$$

These four couplings completely determine the masses of light generation of down quarks and charged leptons as well as CKM mixing angles V_{us} and V_{ub} . In order to study the effects of these couplings, it is useful to work in terms of $SU(5)$ multiplets. With $16_i = 10_i + \bar{5}_i + 1_i$, $10 = 5 + \bar{5}$, $10' = 5' + \bar{5}'$, and substituting appropriate VEVs, the couplings (3), (6) yield the following mass matrix relevant for down quark and charged lepton masses:

$$\begin{matrix} 10_1 \\ 10_2 \\ 10_3 \\ 5' \\ 5 \end{matrix} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{5}_1 & \bar{5}_2 & \bar{5}_3 & \bar{5} & \bar{5}' \\ \epsilon^4 \bar{h}_H & \epsilon_C \bar{h}_C & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \epsilon_C \bar{h}_C & \epsilon^2 \bar{h}_H & \epsilon \bar{h}_H & \epsilon \bar{h}_C & \epsilon \bar{h}_H \\ 0 & \epsilon \bar{h}_H & \bar{h}_H & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \epsilon \langle \Sigma \rangle & 0 \\ 0 & \epsilon \langle C \rangle & 0 & 0 & \epsilon \langle \Sigma \rangle \end{pmatrix} , \quad (7)$$

³One can check that an extension with only 10-plets or $C, \bar{C}$ states cannot yield a satisfactory picture. It seems necessary to invoke both 10, $10'$ and $C, \bar{C}$ states.

where $\bar{h}_H$ and $\bar{h}_C$ denote $SU(5)$ $\bar{5}$ -plets coming from H and C superfields respectively. With $\epsilon_C (\sim 10^{-2})$ we denote $\langle C \rangle / M_{\text{Pl}}$ in order to indicate (where appropriate) that there is no $SU(5)$ breaking effect in the corresponding coupling. We see that there is strong mixing between $\bar{5}_2$ and $\bar{5}'$ states and it involves the $SU(5)$ violating VEV $\langle \Sigma \rangle$. This will ensure that the wrong asymptotic relations $m_s = m_\mu$, $m_e = m_d$ (common for minimal $SO(10)$ and $SU(5)$ GUTs) are avoided. Here we also assume that the light down higgs doublet h_d resides in H and C (in $\bar{5}^H$ and $\bar{5}^C$ in terms of $SU(5)$):

$$H \supset h_d, \quad C \supset \lambda h_d. \quad (8)$$

Upon integration of 5 , $\bar{5}$, $5'$ and $\bar{5}'$ states, and keeping in mind the content of $SU(5)$ plets and composition of their tensor products $10 \supset q, e^c$, $\bar{5} \supset d^c, l$, $10 \times \bar{5} \times \bar{5}_{H,C} = qd^c h_d + e^c l h_d + \dots$, (7) yields the following 3×3 mass matrices for down quarks and charged leptons,

$$\begin{pmatrix} q_1(e_1^c) \\ q_2(e_2^c) \\ q_3(e_3^c) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} d_1^c(l_1) & d_2^c(l_2) & d_3^c(l_3) \\ \epsilon^4 & \epsilon_C \lambda & 0 \\ \epsilon_C \lambda & \epsilon & \epsilon \\ 0 & \epsilon & 1 \end{pmatrix} h_d. \quad (9)$$

From (6) we see that 16_3 does not couple with 10 , $10'$ states and therefore the relations in (5) are not affected. However, we have now generated masses for the second generation states with the required hierarchies

$$\frac{m_s}{m_b} \sim \frac{m_\mu}{m_\tau} \sim \epsilon, \quad (m_s \neq m_\mu). \quad (10)$$

The CKM mixing angles are

$$V_{us} \sim \lambda, \quad V_{ub} \sim V_{cb} \lambda, \quad \text{with } V_{cb} \sim \epsilon. \quad (11)$$

The d -quark and the electron acquire masses through mixings with their nearest neighbors respectively (see (9)). This yields the following relations

$$m_d = |V_{us}|^2 m_s, \quad m_e = |V_{e\mu}|^2 m_\mu. \quad (12)$$

There is no $SU(5)$ symmetry violating effects in the $(1, 2)$ and $(2, 1)$ entries of (9). This leads to another predictive relation at the high scale,

$$\frac{m_e}{m_d} = \frac{m_s}{m_\mu}. \quad (13)$$

With $\frac{m_\mu}{m_s} \approx 3$ near M_G [19], we have the desirable asymptotic relation $\frac{m_e}{m_d} \approx 0.3$. Thus, with a relatively simple $SO(10)$ model we have obtained a realistic pattern of charged fermion masses and their mixings.

Finally, the leptonic mixing angles acquire small contributions from the charged lepton sector, to wit, $\theta_{e\mu} \simeq \sqrt{\frac{m_e}{m_\mu}}$, $\theta_{\mu\tau} \sim \epsilon$. Therefore, the neutral lepton sector (involving right handed neutrinos) must play an important role in order to obtain a satisfactory explanation of the solar and atmospheric neutrino anomalies. As we will see now the 10 , $10'$ states introduced above are also important for recovering bi-large neutrino mixings.

The Dirac mass matrix for ν, ν^c differs from the case when there are only fermionic 16_i -plets. The light lepton doublets by appropriate weights reside also in the 10-plets. This is indeed crucial point for natural bi-large neutrino mixings in our model. The couplings in eqs. (3), (6) yield the following matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} l_1 \\ l_2 \\ l_3 \\ l_5 \\ l_{5'} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_1^c & \nu_2^c & \nu_3^c & \bar{l}_{5'} & \bar{l}_5 \\ \epsilon^4 h_H & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \epsilon^2 h_H & \epsilon h_H & 0 & \epsilon \langle C \rangle \\ 0 & \epsilon h_H & h_H & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \epsilon \langle \Sigma \rangle & 0 \\ 0 & \epsilon h_H & 0 & 0 & \epsilon \langle \Sigma \rangle \end{pmatrix}, \quad (14)$$

where h_H denotes the up-type higgs doublet coming from H . Integration of $l_5, l_{5'}$ states lead to the 3×3 mass matrix

$$m_D = \begin{pmatrix} l_1 \\ l_2 \\ l_3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_1^c & \nu_2^c & \nu_3^c \\ \epsilon^4 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \epsilon & \epsilon \\ 0 & \epsilon & 1 \end{pmatrix} h_H. \quad (15)$$

We see that (15) differs in structure from the up type quark mass matrix. In particular, the (2, 2) and (3, 2) elements in (15) are of the same order (in ϵ). This offers a natural way for large $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ mixing. However, we should also ensure the generation of the required value of $\Delta m_{\text{sol}}^2 / \Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2 \sim 1/5$, i.e. at leading order only one eigenstate should have mass close to $\sqrt{\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2}^4$. This is possible to realize if effectively in the see-saw mechanism only one RHN exchange dominates (the single RHN dominance mechanism) [20], [21]. For this to be realized the other two RHN states should decouple [21] without significant contribution to the light neutrino mass matrix.

To achieve this, we introduce three $SO(10)$ singlet states N_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) with R -charges

$$\alpha_{N_2} = \alpha_3 + \frac{3}{2}\alpha_H - \alpha_\Sigma - \frac{1}{4}\alpha_S, \quad \alpha_{N_1} = \alpha_{N_2} + 2\alpha_\Sigma + \frac{1}{2}\alpha_S, \quad \alpha_{N_3} = \alpha_{N_2} - \alpha_\Sigma + \alpha_S. \quad (16)$$

Note that for the time being not all phases in table 1 and (16) are fixed. Taking

$$\alpha_H = \alpha_\Sigma + \frac{1}{4}\alpha_S, \quad (17)$$

the couplings involving N -states are

$$\begin{pmatrix} 16_1 \\ 16_2 \\ 16_3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} N_1 & N_2 & N_3 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{S}{M_{\text{Pl}}} & \frac{\Sigma}{M_{\text{Pl}}} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \bar{C}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} N_1 \\ N_2 \\ N_3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} N_1 & N_2 & N_3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} M_{\text{Pl}}. \quad (18)$$

From eqs. (15), (18) the 9×9 mass matrix for neutral fermions is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \nu \\ \nu^c \\ N \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nu & \nu^c & N \\ 0 & m_D & \Delta \\ m_D^T & 0 & M \\ \Delta^T & M^T & M_N \end{pmatrix}, \quad (19)$$

⁴This requirement must be fulfilled because the neutrino masses turn out to be hierarchical.

where M and Δ emerge from the first matrix coupling of (18), while M_N accounts for NN -type coupling. The Δ contribution is non zero if the up type higgs doublet $h_{\bar{C}}$ from $\bar{C}$ has non zero VEV. Integration of the heavy ν^c , N states induces contributions to the light neutrino mass matrix given by the double see-saw formula

$$m_{\nu}^{(0)} = m_D \frac{1}{M^T} M_N \frac{1}{M} m_D^T - \Delta \frac{1}{M} m_D^T - m_D \frac{1}{M^T} \Delta^T . \quad (20)$$

To analyze this mass matrix it is convenient to work in a basis in which the first coupling matrix of (18) is diagonal. With this change of basis the structures of m_D and M_N will be unchanged and we can parameterize the relevant matrices as

$$m_D = \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon^4 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \beta\epsilon & \alpha\epsilon \\ 0 & \alpha\epsilon & 1 \end{pmatrix} h_H , \quad \frac{1}{M} = \text{Diag}(\epsilon, n_1, \epsilon) \cdot \frac{1}{M_{\text{Pl}}\epsilon^2} , \quad M_N = \text{Diag}(0, n_2, 0) M_{\text{Pl}} , \quad (21)$$

where the dimensionless couplings $\alpha, \beta, n_{1,2}$ of order unity have been identified in order to demonstrate that our goal (for which N -states have been introduced) is achieved.

Employing (20), the dominant contribution to the 3×3 neutrino mass matrix is given by

$$m_{\nu}^{(0)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \beta^2 & \alpha\beta \\ 0 & \alpha\beta & \alpha^2 \end{pmatrix} \frac{m}{|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2} , \quad \text{with} \quad m = (|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2) n_1^2 n_2 \frac{(h_H^0)^2}{M_{\text{Pl}}\epsilon^2} . \quad (22)$$

We see that only one eigenstate of (22) is massive with $m_{\nu_3} = m \sim \frac{(h_H^0)^2}{M_{\text{Pl}}\epsilon^2} = 0.01 - 0.1$ eV - the scale relevant for atmospheric neutrino oscillations. Moreover, the 2-3 mixing angle θ_{23} is naturally large for $\alpha \sim \beta \sim 1$. The form in (22) emerges from the first term in (20). The second and third terms of (20) induce (negligible) corrections irrelevant for neutrino oscillations.

For explaining the solar neutrino anomaly, we introduce an additional singlet state $\mathcal{N}$ with the R -charge $\alpha_{\mathcal{N}} = \alpha_3 + \frac{1}{2}\alpha_H + 2\alpha_{\Sigma} - \frac{3}{2}\alpha_S$. Note that we still have some freedom in selection of phases (determining the R -charges), and we use this freedom to take $\alpha_{\Sigma} = \frac{29}{48}\alpha_S, \alpha_{\bar{S}} = \frac{1}{12}\alpha_S$. With this and the prescriptions in table 1, and noting (17), the relevant superpotential couplings are

$$\bar{S}\mathcal{N}10'\bar{C}\bar{C} + S^2\mathcal{N}16_1\bar{C} + \bar{S}^7\mathcal{N}^2 , \quad (23)$$

where we have omitted appropriate powers of M_{Pl} which can be restored when needed. Note that the $10'$ -plet contains the l_2 (ν_2) state with weight ~ 1 . So, the coupling of $10'$ in (23) is of great importance. With this setting the coupling $\bar{S}\Sigma\mathcal{N}16_3\bar{C}$ is also allowed. Since this coupling is relevant we will take it into account for generality. Substituting appropriate VEVs and integrating the $\mathcal{N}$ state we get a sub dominant contribution to the light neutrino mass matrix

$$m_{\nu}^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\alpha}^2 & \bar{\alpha}\bar{\beta} & \bar{\alpha}\bar{\gamma} \\ \bar{\alpha}\bar{\beta} & \bar{\beta}^2 & \bar{\beta}\bar{\gamma} \\ \bar{\alpha}\bar{\gamma} & \bar{\beta}\bar{\gamma} & \bar{\gamma}^2 \end{pmatrix} m' , \quad (24)$$

where the dimensionless couplings $\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}, \bar{\gamma} \sim 1$ and

$$m' \sim \frac{\langle h_{\bar{C}} \rangle^2}{M_{\text{Pl}} \epsilon^3} . \quad (25)$$

We already see that the mixing angle θ_{12} is naturally large for $\bar{\alpha} \sim \bar{\beta} \sim 1$. As far as the mass scale m' is concerned, assuming the light physical up type higgs doublet is contained in H and $\bar{C}$ with weights

$$H \supset h_u , \quad \bar{C} \supset \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{5}} h_u , \quad (26)$$

we have $m' = 2 \cdot 10^{-3} - 5 \cdot 10^{-2}$ eV, which accounts for solar neutrino oscillations.

Next we study in detail the full neutrino mass matrix. Although in the neutrino sector there were many unknown parameters, the effective 3×3 neutrino mass matrix has a relatively simple structure. Because of this, the model enables one to calculate the third mixing angle θ_{13} in terms of other measured oscillation parameters. Once more we emphasize that this is possible thanks to the fermionic 10-plets.

The neutrino mass matrix can be written as

$$m_\nu = m_\nu^{(0)} + m_\nu^{(1)} , \quad (27)$$

where $m_\nu^{(0)}$ denotes the dominant part responsible for the atmospheric anomaly, while the subdominant entry $m_\nu^{(1)}$ ensures large angle solar neutrino oscillations. They are given in (22) and (24), with $m'/m \ll 1$. The leading part can be diagonalized by the transformation $U_{23}^T m_\nu^{(0)} U_{23} = \bar{m}_\nu^{(0)} = \text{Diag}(0, 0, m)$, with

$$U_{23} = P \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c_{23} & s_{23} \\ 0 & -s_{23} & c_{23} \end{pmatrix} , \quad (28)$$

where $c_{23} \equiv \cos \theta_{23}$, $s_{23} \equiv \sin \theta_{23}$, and

$$\tan \theta_{23} = \frac{|\beta|}{|\alpha|} , \quad P = \text{Diag}(1, e^{i\chi}, 1) , \quad \chi = -\text{Arg}(\alpha\beta) . \quad (29)$$

By this rotation, the sub-leading part transforms into

$$\bar{m}_\nu^{(1)} = U_{23}^T m_\nu^{(1)} U_{23} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\alpha}^2 & \bar{\alpha}\tilde{\beta} & \bar{\alpha}\tilde{\gamma} \\ \bar{\alpha}\tilde{\beta} & \tilde{\beta}^2 & \tilde{\beta}\tilde{\gamma} \\ \bar{\alpha}\tilde{\gamma} & \tilde{\beta}\tilde{\gamma} & \tilde{\gamma}^2 \end{pmatrix} \cdot m' ,$$

$$\text{with } \tilde{\beta} = (\bar{\beta} c_{23} e^{i\chi} - \bar{\gamma} s_{23}) , \quad \tilde{\gamma} = (\bar{\beta} s_{23} e^{i\chi} + \bar{\gamma} c_{23}) . \quad (30)$$

From (30) we see that for $\bar{\alpha} \sim \bar{\beta}$ the angle θ_{12} is naturally large and therefore bi-large neutrino mixing is realized. On the other hand, the third mixing angle $\theta_{13} \sim \frac{m'}{m} \sim \sqrt{\frac{\Delta m_{\text{sol}}^2}{\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2}}$ is properly suppressed⁵.

⁵A similar relation was obtained in a democratic scenario [22] with discrete symmetries. We note, however, that so far it has not been generated within a GUT scenario supplemented by symmetry arguments.

The model allows one to make one more prediction if somehow the coupling $\mathcal{N}16_3\bar{C}$ can be forbidden. This is realized with a suitable modification of R -charges. For example, if the last coupling in (6) is generated through the integration of some additional states. Introduce the vector-like fermionic pair $F(16) + \bar{F}(\bar{16})$ and, instead of the last term in (6), consider the couplings

$$16_2 F H + \frac{S}{M_{\text{Pl}}} 10' \bar{F} \bar{C} + \bar{S} \bar{F} F . \quad (31)$$

One can verify that with substitution of appropriate VEVs and upon integration of $F, \bar{F}$ states, the operator $\frac{\langle S \rangle \bar{C}}{\langle \bar{S} \rangle M_{\text{Pl}}} 10' H 16_2 \sim \frac{\bar{C}}{M_{\text{Pl}}} 10' H 16_2$ is generated, so that all results obtained in the charged fermion sector are robust. However, with the couplings in (31) the corresponding R -charges are modified as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_C &\rightarrow \alpha_C - \frac{1}{4}(\alpha_S - \alpha_{\bar{S}}) , \quad \alpha_{\bar{C}} \rightarrow \alpha_{\bar{C}} - \frac{3}{4}(\alpha_S - \alpha_{\bar{S}}) , \quad \alpha_{16_1} \rightarrow \alpha_{16_1} + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha_S - \alpha_{\bar{S}}) , \\ \alpha_{10} &\rightarrow \alpha_{10} + \frac{1}{4}(\alpha_S - \alpha_{\bar{S}}) , \quad \alpha_{10'} \rightarrow \alpha_{10'} - \frac{1}{4}(\alpha_S - \alpha_{\bar{S}}) , \quad \alpha_{N_i} \rightarrow \alpha_{N_i} + \frac{3}{4}(\alpha_S - \alpha_{\bar{S}}) , \\ \alpha_{\mathcal{N}} &\rightarrow \alpha_{\mathcal{N}} + \frac{1}{4}(\alpha_S - \alpha_{\bar{S}}) . \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

The R -charges of states which are not given here are unchanged. With this changes and with the following relations between phases:

$$\alpha_H = \alpha_{\Sigma} - \frac{1}{2}\alpha_S + \frac{3}{4}\alpha_{\bar{S}} , \quad \alpha_{\Sigma} = \frac{79}{64}\alpha_S , \quad \alpha_{\bar{S}} = -\frac{3}{8}\alpha_S , \quad (33)$$

all of the couplings presented above, with exception of $\mathcal{N}16_3\bar{C}$, survive. With $\bar{\gamma} = 0$, (30) reduces to

$$\bar{m}_{\nu}^{(1)} = U_{23}^T m_{\nu}^{(1)} U_{23} = \tilde{P} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\alpha}^2 & c_{23}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\beta} & s_{23}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\beta} \\ c_{23}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\beta} & c_{23}^2\bar{\beta}^2 & c_{23}s_{23}\bar{\beta}^2 \\ s_{23}\bar{\alpha}\bar{\beta} & c_{23}s_{23}\bar{\beta}^2 & s_{23}^2\bar{\beta}^2 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \tilde{P} m' , \quad (34)$$

where $\tilde{P} = \text{Diag}(1, e^{-i\chi}, e^{-i\chi})$.

The matrix $\bar{m}_{\nu} = \bar{m}_{\nu}^{(0)} + \bar{m}_{\nu}^{(1)}$ is diagonalized by the transformation $U_{12}^T U_{13}^T \bar{m}_{\nu} U_{13} U_{12} = m_{\nu}^{\text{diag}}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} U_{12} &\simeq P' \cdot \begin{pmatrix} c_{12} , & s_{12} , & 0 \\ -s_{12} , & c_{12} , & 0 \\ 0 , & 0 , & 1 \end{pmatrix} , \quad U_{13} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} c_{13}e^{i\delta} , & 0 , & s_{13}e^{i\delta} \\ 0 , & 1 , & 0 \\ -s_{13} , & 0 , & c_{13} \end{pmatrix} , \\ P' &= \text{Diag} \left(e^{i\chi'} , e^{-i\chi} , e^{-i\chi} \right) , \quad \chi' = -\text{Arg}(\bar{\alpha}\bar{\beta}) , \quad \delta = -\text{Arg} \left(\frac{m'\bar{\alpha}\bar{\beta}}{m} \right) , \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

$$\tan \theta_{12} = \frac{|\bar{\alpha}|}{c_{23}|\bar{\beta}|} , \quad \tan \theta_{13}^{\nu} = \left| \frac{m'}{m} \right| s_{23}|\bar{\alpha}\bar{\beta}| , \quad (36)$$

$$m_{\nu}^{\text{diag}} = \text{Diag}(0, m_2, m) , \quad m_2 = m'(|\bar{\alpha}|^2 + c_{23}^2|\bar{\beta}|^2) . \quad (37)$$

For the θ_{13}^ν mixing angle we have introduced the superscript ' ν ' in order to indicate that this contribution comes from the neutrino sector. As we will see, the whole leptonic mixing angle $\theta_{13} \equiv |U_{e3}^l|$ receives sizable contribution also from the charged lepton sector. Using (36), (37) and the relation $|\frac{m_2}{m}| \simeq \sqrt{\frac{\Delta m_{\text{sol}}^2}{\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2}}$, we find

$$\tan \theta_{13}^\nu \simeq \sqrt{\frac{\Delta m_{\text{sol}}^2}{\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2}} \frac{\tan \theta_{12} \tan \theta_{23}}{1 + \tan^2 \theta_{12}}. \quad (38)$$

Using the current data [23], we find

$$\theta_{13}^\nu \simeq 0.05 - 0.14. \quad (39)$$

For the central values

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta m_{\text{sol}}^2 &= 7.9 \cdot 10^{-5} \text{eV}^2, & \Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2 &= 2.4 \cdot 10^{-3} \text{eV}^2, \\ \sin^2 \theta_{12} &= 0.314, & \sin^2 \theta_{23} &= 0.44, \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

(38) yields $(\theta_{13}^\nu)^{\text{cent}} \simeq 0.075$. Now we can derive the (1,3) element of the leptonic mixing matrix U^l . A sizable contribution from the charged lepton sector comes only for $\theta_{13} \equiv |U_{e3}^l|$. Namely, the charged lepton (1,2) mixing angle $\theta_{e\mu} \simeq \sqrt{\frac{m_e}{m_\mu}}$ is relevant. Taking this into account, we obtain

$$\theta_{13} \equiv |U_{e3}^l| \simeq \left| \tan \theta_{13}^\nu - \sqrt{\frac{m_e}{m_\mu}} s_{23} e^{i(\delta-\chi)} \right| \cos \theta_{13}^\nu, \quad (41)$$

where angles and phases are defined in (29), (35)-(38). Since the phase $\delta - \chi$ is unknown, we can calculate a range for $|U_{e3}^l|$. Namely, from (41),

$$\begin{aligned} \text{for } \theta_{13}^\nu &= 0.05, & \theta_{13} &= 0.01 - 0.09, \\ \text{for } \theta_{13}^\nu &= 0.14, & \theta_{13} &= 0.08 - 0.2. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Thus, finally we get⁶

$$\theta_{13} = 0.01 - 0.2. \quad (43)$$

The upper range in (43) is consistent with the current experimental bound [25], while future experiments [26] should be able to probe values close to 0.01.

In summary we have proposed a relatively simple extension of minimal $SO(10)$ by introducing two 'matter' 10-plets (and possibly one pair of vector-like matter $16 + \overline{16}$ allowing us to predict the value of θ_{13}) plus some $SO(10)$ singlets. Augmented by a R -symmetry these states play an essential role in understanding the hierarchies in the charged fermion sector and in realizing bi-large mixing in the neutrino sector. The third leptonic mixing angle turns out to be naturally suppressed, in the range of $0.01 - 0.2$. The R -symmetry also implies 'matter' parity, so that the LSP is stable. It also forbids Planck scale suppressed baryon number violating dimension five operators. Since R -symmetry has previously been shown to play an essential role in the construction of realistic $SO(10)$ inflation models [27], [15], it would be interesting to try to merge the two approaches and also include leptogenesis. This will be attempted elsewhere.

⁶Numerically similar values have been recently predicted in [24].

References

- [1] H. Georgi, in *Particles and Fields*, Ed. by C. Carlson (AIP, NY, 1975);
H. Fritzsch and P. Minkowski, *Annals Phys.* **93** (1975) 193;
It may be possible to extend our considerations to the subgroup $SU(4) \times SU(2) \times SU(2)$,
J. C. Pati and A. Salam, *Phys. Rev. D* **10** (1974) 275.
- [2] S. Fukuda *et al.* [Super-Kamiokande Collaboration], *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 3999 (2000) [hep-ex/0009001].
- [3] S. Fukuda *et al.* [Super-Kamiokande Collaboration], *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86** (2001) 5651 [hep-ex/0103032];
K. Eguchi *et al.* [KamLAND Collaboration], *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90** (2003) 021802 [hep-ex/0212021].
- [4] M. Fukugita and T. Yanagida, *Phys. Lett. B* **174** (1986) 45;
For non-thermal leptogenesis see G. Lazarides and Q. Shafi, *Phys. Lett. B* **258** (1991) 305.
- [5] G. Lazarides, Q. Shafi and C. Wetterich, *Nucl. Phys. B* **181** (1981) 287.
- [6] S. Dimopoulos and F. Wilczek, Print-81-0600 (SANTA BARBARA);
M. Srednicki, *Nucl. Phys. B* **202** (1982) 327.
- [7] C. Panagiotakopoulos, Q. Shafi and C. Wetterich, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55** (1985) 787.
- [8] K. S. Babu and S. M. Barr, *Phys. Rev. D* **48**, 5354 (1993) [hep-ph/9306242];
L. J. Hall and S. Raby, *Phys. Rev. D* **51**, 6524 (1995) [hep-ph/9501298];
K. S. Babu, J. C. Pati and F. Wilczek, *Nucl. Phys. B* **566** (2000) 33 [hep-ph/9812538].
- [9] K. S. Babu and Q. Shafi, *Phys. Lett. B* **357** (1995) 365 [hep-ph/9503313].
- [10] G. Anderson, S. Raby, S. Dimopoulos, L. J. Hall and G. D. Starkman, *Phys. Rev. D* **49** (1994) 3660 [hep-ph/9308333].
- [11] Z. G. Berezhiani, *Phys. Lett. B* **355** (1995) 178 [hep-ph/9505384].
- [12] Z. Berezhiani and Z. Tavartkiladze, *Phys. Lett. B* **409** (1997) 220 [hep-ph/9612232].
- [13] Q. Shafi and Z. Tavartkiladze, *Phys. Lett. B* **487** (2000) 145 [hep-ph/9910314]; *Nucl. Phys. B* **665** (2003) 469 [hep-ph/0303150].
- [14] N. Maekawa, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **106** (2001) 401 [hep-ph/0104200];
N. Maekawa and T. Yamashita, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **108** (2002) 719 [hep-ph/0205185].
- [15] B. Kyae and Q. Shafi, hep-ph/0504044.
- [16] J. C. Pati, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **18** (2003) 4135 [hep-ph/0305221].

- [17] K. Matsuda *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **65** (2002) 033008 [hep-ph/0108202];
T. Fukuyama and N. Okada, JHEP **0211** (2002) 011 [hep-ph/0205066];
C. S. Aulakh, B. Bajc, A. Melfo, G. Senjanovic and F. Vissani, Phys. Lett. B **588**, 196 (2004) [hep-ph/0306242];
H. S. Goh, R. N. Mohapatra and S. P. Ng, Phys. Rev. D **68** (2003) 115008 [hep-ph/0308197];
M. C. Chen and K. T. Mahanthappa, Phys. Rev. D **70** (2004) 113013 [hep-ph/0409096];
C. S. Aulakh, hep-ph/0506291, and references therein;
B. Dutta, Y. Mimura and R. N. Mohapatra, hep-ph/0507319;
K. S. Babu, I. Gogoladze, P. Nath and R. M. Syed, hep-ph/0506312.
- [18] Q. Shafi and C. Wetterich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52** (1984) 875;
C. T. Hill, Phys. Lett. B **135**, 47 (1984).
- [19] H. Georgi and C. Jarlskog, Phys. Lett. B **86** (1979) 297.
- [20] D. Suematsu, Phys. Lett. B **392** (1997) 413 [hep-ph/9604242];
S. F. King, Phys. Lett. B **439** (1998) 350 [hep-ph/9806440];
S. Davidson and S. F. King, Phys. Lett. B **445**, 191 (1998) [hep-ph/9808296];
Q. Shafi and Z. Tavartkiladze, Phys. Lett. B **451**, 129 (1999) [hep-ph/9901243].
- [21] Q. Shafi and Z. Tavartkiladze, Phys. Lett. B **448** (1999) 46 [hep-ph/9811463].
- [22] Q. Shafi and Z. Tavartkiladze, Phys. Lett. B **594** (2004) 177 [hep-ph/0401235].
- [23] G. L. Fogli, E. Lisi, A. Marrone, A. Palazzo and A. M. Rotunno, [hep-ph/0506307].
- [24] J. Ferrandis and S. Pakvasa, Phys. Lett. B **603** (2004) 184 [hep-ph/0409204];
S. F. King, JHEP **0508** (2005) 105 [hep-ph/0506297].
- [25] M. Apollonio *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. C **27** (2003) 331 [hep-ex/0301017].
- [26] Y. Itow *et al.*, hep-ex/0106019;
D. Beavis *et al.*, hep-ex/0205040;
D. Ayres *et al.* [Nova Collaboration], hep-ex/0210005.
- [27] B. Kyae and Q. Shafi, Phys. Rev. D **69** (2004) 046004 [hep-ph/0212331].